6/1/70

Howard (5/27 w enclosures), Dick (5/26 w. enclosures),

Howard saying his Specter stuff is to be in his book prompts me to suggest that, in addition to any other use he may plan, it should also be presented as an explanation of how all of this became possible and, with it, Specter's personal fortunes did not suffer. I'd like a copy of the article Skolnick sent saying he would subpena Johnson, and, because in the future it may have meaning, a record of the dates on which you get what may be helpful. If he sends yous any letters, please let me know. He is making a big thing out of Kennedy buffs, as he describes them, from all over the country, getting in touch with him, in the context he is the new savior, the one looked up to as the man who can do what no one else has been able to. For real. Agreed on Sprague. He had already given me those names but avoided direct response to my question asking who the "About six confessions" came from. I have never seen Lifton's thing, but I do have the executive sessions and I think you'd do better, if you want them, to get them from the Archives, where you kight inquire about the cost. The rest of that thing, if you do not already have it, is available and not worth spending money for to get poorer copies. Proposed letter to Rhoads is good. No major suggestions.

Dick, okay on Nichols. Sorry and glad to hear about Murr. He was so proud of his son and seemed so happy with jis marriage. Give him by best hopes and wishes. I've had no response from Mayhew. Sprague is a waste of time for me will not listen. Harry Dean is a former fink. I turned him on by radio and he came to Newcombs, when I was there, for me to interview him. Fred messed it up when I turned it over to him. I mean the messing-up was thorough. But there is absolutely no basis for Sprague's libel and nothing of which I know that can be misinterpreted as any kind of confession. He bears a slight resemblance to the man in CE237, was connected with Hall in a special way I'll not now go into, has been a spy inside FPCC, etc. I have it all on tape. The sole basis for his believing this cop was "phoney" to begin with is the apparently erroneous belief he was wearing mocassins, which is not as exceptional as he thin thought. Nor is there anything unusual in a cop wearing rubbers when it was raining when he went on duty. His identity is not secret. I had the names onece. This is the wierdest irresponsibility. There is no doubt other cops, including Harkness, saw him, and who not sivk in the head would conceive Harkness would permit his picture to be taken with a phoney cop? There is no time to go into all the possibilities of the brain matter near the manhole, but one you do not include is a later shot not visible in Zapruder. I think the act of falling would not have carried it that distance from the car, even laterally alone. However, recall Weiztman found a piece very close to the gutter on that wrong side of the street. Laterally, that is close to the same distance.

Hastily,

5/28/70

Dear Dick,

As I went out to mail letters to you, I received your 5/22 to me, and will respond briefly.

On Sprague, I agree that we shouldn't get involved in discussion on this. I still feel it is potentially"dangerous"in that it is something which can be seized by those who oppose us as an example of our carelessness, ignorance, and exaggeration--etc.

I think I may be conveying to both you and Harold the wrong idea about my beliefs by my flagrant use of "conservative" and "liberal." I am neither, and wish to be labeled as neither. To me, there is no "right" or "left"; There is right or wrong. I subscribe to what I believe is right, whether it may be arbitrarily classified with a particular political stand or not.

Thanks for the comments on 00-buckshot. These shootings are a perfect case where an autopsy clarified things, where prior to the autopsy a state existed similar to what happened with assass. Good analogy, I think.

Don't send Penn Jones' editorial. Skolnick sent it to me along with his other stuff, including an article that said he would be subpoenoing Lyndon Johnson.

Have heard nothing of the book you describe by Albert Newman. It sounds like something which would benefit all if its existance were not known, though.

Now that I think about it, I would like to borrow Lifton's "Documentary Appendium" with the Exec. Sessions in it. Send it when you get a chance, OK? Unless it is extremely heavy and will cost a lot to mail. If so, I might buy one for myself already.

Stay well,

cc Harold

NOTE: This is a proposed letter to Rhoads which bears on the slides recently made for me at Archives. I think it may bear on Harold's efforts to get the spectro analysis and may have other significances, so I am sending it to Harold and Dick for comment and possible revision before I send it to Rhoads.

Dear Dr. Rhoads:

I address this letter to you because I feel it concerns a matter which should be brought to your attention.

I have corresponded with a member of your staff, Mr. Mark G. Eckhoff, on matters germane to the records of the Warren Commission. Just recently, the Archives prepared for me an order of color slides made of certain ballistics specimens in the Commission's evidence. Please allow me to express my deepest gratitude to your staff for having followed the details of my request so closely.

There are, however, certain things about the slides which puzzle me and about which I seek your explanation. In particular, one slide does not appear at all consistant with the original exhibits introduced into evidence at the Commission hearings. The following anomalies are apparent:

(1) CE 840 allegedly consists of 3 fragments of metal removed from the carpet beneath the left jump seat in the Presidential limousine during the early morning hours of November 23, 1963. FBI agent Robert Frazier testified to this fact before the Commission (see volume 5 of the hearings, page 66). The photograph of CE 849 printed by the Commission (volume 17, page 840) is somewhat inconsistant with this description. It shows three fragments of similar size plus an addition, although extremely small one at about 8 o'clock (see enclosed sketch--will be sending a sketch along with this-HR). I do not know the origin of this additional minute fleck.

However, in the slide including CE 849 provided to me by the Archives, only 2 fragments are shown in addition to this tiny fleck(see sketch). The letter from Mr. Eckhoff which accompanied the slides did not explain this anomaly. I would therefore like to know a)why the third fragment from CE 840 was not included in my picture, b) if that fragment is still in the possession of the Archives or its present whereabouts, and c) why a fourth fragment in the form of a tiny fleck appears in an exhibit which proports to show three fragments.

(2) CE 843 allegedly consists of 2 metallic fragments removed from President Kennedy's head during the autopsy. Commander Humes testified that these two fragments measured 7 by 2mm and 3 by 1mm respectively (volume 2, page 354). When introduced into evidence before the Commission, CE 843 was described by Agent Frazier as consisting of 2 fragments (volume 5, page 73). If you will consult the picture of CE 843 printed by the Commission (volume 17, page 841), you will see that it actually shows 3 pieces of metal, one appearing as a minute dot (see sketch).

The slide which includes CE 843 also portrays a metric scale by which the exhibits may be measured. While the

disposition of the fragments in this photo appears consistant with those depicted in the Commission's photo, there is a definate inconsistancy with the sworn descriptions of the fragments. By the scale in my picture, I can judge that the two measurable fragments are 3 by 1mm and 4 by 3mm in size respectively. No fragment depicted in my picture has a dimention of 7mm as described by Commander Humes. I would like to know a) why three fragments appear in an exhibit which is sworn to consist of 2 fragments, and b) why one of those fragments is smaller (by about 3mm) than described in the hearings.

(3) CE 857 consists of bullet fragments from an experiment in which a skull was fired upon in an effort to duplicate President Kennedy's head wounds; it consists of 2 large fragments and several minute ones. These several minute fragments are also depicted in CE 859. I had requested in my original order for the slides that the tiny particles from CE 857 be included in one of the pictures.

By letter of May 19, 1970, Mr. Eckhoff informed me that "We do not have the small bullet fragments shown in Commission Exhibits 859 and 857...The fragments in CE 859 are therefore not included in slide 'D'."

I am at a loss to understand how the Archives couldnot have these fragments. When CE 857 was described before the Commission by Dr. Oliver (who conducted the tests), it was said to contain these small fragments. In Dr. Oliver's own words, "...they are supposed to be all there." (see volume 5, page 88).

Please explain to me why the Archives does not have the small fragments depicted in CE 857, which <u>was</u> introduced into the Commission's evidence.

I believe it is the duty of the Archives to insure the integrity of these vital pieces of evidence. In connection with the above mentioned, I am prompted to ask these additional questions.

(4) Has any of the Commission's ballistics evidence been inadvertantly damaged or mutilated since it came into possession of the National Archives? This includes not only loss of substance (as in the case of CE 399's base) but also change of form or shape, no matter how minute or seemingly insignificant. If any such changes have transpired, I would like to know under which circumstances they did occur.

(5) Has any of the ballistics evidence aver been mounted in a pliable substance (such as clay) for the purpose of being photographed or examined since it came into possession of the Archives? If so, please inform me of the "mounting" substance, the particular exhibits and portions thereof which were contacted by this substance, and the residues, if any, which remained on the exhibit.

I would truly appreaciate your assistance in these matters.

Sincerely,

5/27/70

Dear Dick and Harold,

This is in response to Dick's 5/19 and Harold's 5/25.

On Dick's, not much comment is needed really. On the neck fragments, I'll be writing Fisher tomorrow to get details as I did with Morgan. I'll be writing through an aunt of mine who lives in New York. This, I think, should keep F unsuspecting--will use different style, typewriter, paper, and will be mailing it from New York since I have to go there Friday anyway. Hope he does not refuse to give info.

On Dick's added suggestion of a doctored military round, it is interesting that one of my Archives slides shows an X scratched on the nose of the Walker bullet. This does not go deep, and I can't explain it.

On Harold's, glad that the Skolnick transcript was of use. Will ask Fred for reference on ~~X~~ CD's...when I can, I'll get you and Dick copies of Lifton's latest to me as you request.

Nothing else really. Am back to working on my book. I think the best approach for me to take so far as Dick's chief complaint of focus goes is to treat my subject matter in ~~XXXXX~~ terms of the question of LHO's guilt. As small part of the book deals with the shooting itself with the photos. This, actually condensed from what previously consituted the entire thing, will focus on not only what the pictures show and do not show, but how the WC misused them (my Specter thing with Shaneyfelt and first shot has not been published before) plus how the "critics" misuse them--notably Tink and his "scientific" analysis.

~~XXXXXXX~~ I think this would give a good overview of the assass, in addition to perhaps bringing the matter of pix into perspective (which WWII and Photo Whitewash do in detail).

The next part of my book will deal with the medical evidence. This, of course, is central in the matter of LHO guilt/innocense. I've already revised (re-written, actually) half of the "term paper" I'd done this past winter. This should serve to explain the nature of the medical evidence and the people who produced it, My Panel stuff goes here. From that I go into the wounds themselves, what I've come up with on them, with great credit to both of you, though not using what Harold has gotten.

The last part of book will deal directly with matters relating to LHO and what amounts to his non-involvement with the shooting.

I think that the book will contain many "new" things. (Oh yes, my Specter stuff goes in also). It may not be a substantial or outstanding contribution to advancing our knowledge of the assassination conspiracy. I cannot do that. I think, however, that it could be a valuable accumulation of things (plus new things) which would demonstrate very convincingly and effectively how LHO was innocent of the shooting. Other things too. This could not hurt us, and I believe it is something of which I am currently capable.

Still,

Jim